FELLOWSHIP

September 1943 Vol. IX—No. 9

"If we win this war, it will be a most unfortunate thing to have upon the statute books a national pledge for national military compulsory service, for which we are neither prepared by our past history nor invited by our ideals for the future. A nation which lives in peace times under universal military compulsory service is a nation of slaves."

— From a speech in the U. S. Senate
by Senator John Sharp Williams
March 29, 1918.

Two Labor Day Articles

Labor Today and Tomorrow

By JAMES MYERS

Labor After the War

By WALTER G. MUELDER

•

"Unconditional Surrender" by Laurence Housman

As the War Rolls On by A. J. Muste

•

A Full Page of News on COs in Prison

15 cents a copy $1.50 a Year

John Haynes Holmes

Last month, in this column, I submitted comment on the complaints of some of our conscientious objectors in the CPS camps—dear, gallant fellows who are terribly disappointed at the disabilities of their lot. I tried to make plain (1) that all men are suffering disabilities in these war times; (2) that pacifists must expect to suffer special disabilities—frustrations of a particularly acute nature—since there can be no reconciliation between pacifism and war; and (3) that pacifists should rejoice to carry crosses, and thus bear witness to their faith. This last point is of central importance: that we should be glad to suffer for the cause to which we have committed our lives, and therewith, if the pacifist doctrine is sound, best serve this cause! Complaints are out of place, a betrayal of our high purpose. Imagine how we would feel if, in some old manuscript, we found a record of complaints and protests by the early Christians! These did not ask for "work of their own choosing" or demand "adequate compensation" for their sacrifice, but sought only the chance to die for the Lord Jesus.

I

Behind the situation in the CPS camps, as I see it, is a certain lack of understanding of that religious spirit that I like to feel is central to true pacifism. For there is a spiritual philosophy, a doctrine of faith and life, that should enable pacifists to endure not only minor and insignificant difficulties, but such genuine trials and tribulations, persecutions and perils, as came, for example, to St. Paul when he was able "having done all, to stand," not only with courage of heart but with rejoicing of soul.

This spiritual philosophy, or religion, of which I speak, has two aspects. The first is that exemplified so clearly and nobly by the Stoics. Its essence is that man's real life lies within, and is there impenetrable to all "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." The outer world, being material, cannot reach, or touch, the inner world, which is spiritual. Man's soul, in other words, has an integrity of its own that may exist, pure, serene, and steadfast, apart from all the vicissitudes of earthly experience. Only as a man himself breaks down this integrity, by weakness, selfishness, pride, or fleshly desire, can his life be invaded by the things of this world. To live therefore within and not without, in the sure discipline of the spirit, is to be able to defy, or better to ignore, the world. "How easy a thing is it," writes Marcus Aurelius, "for a man to put off from him all turbulent adventitious imaginations, and be in perfect rest and tranquillity!"

Mention of the Emperor Aurelius reminds me that in the *Meditations* of this great Stoic are to be found the noblest statements of this religion of the inner spirit. Better than all expositions of our own are a few quotations from his masterwork, as follows:

> "Of things that are external, let those that suffer them complain if they will; as for me, as long as I conceive not what is happened is evil, I have no hurt, and it is in my power not to conceive any such thing."
>
> "As a pig that cries and flings when his throat is cut, fancy to thyself every one to be that grieves for any worldly thing and takes on. Remember thus, that unto reasonable creatures only it is granted that they may willingly and freely submit unto Providence."
>
> "How happy is man in this his power, that he needs not do anything but what God shall approve, and may embrace contentedly whatsoever God doth send him."

II

This stoical aspect of the religious spirit is pure and noble, but it is not final. At the best, it is negative rather than positive; it is content to endure evil uncomplainingly. But is there not something that we can do about this evil? While enduring it, can we not at the same time strive to overcome it and therewith conquer and destroy it?

It is this which brings us to the second aspect of a true spiritual philosophy, best exemplified, it seems to me, by Christianity. Here, in the teaching of Jesus, do we get what is positive in the sense that the Christian spirit is active rather than passive. Its essence is a creative faculty that endows man with that potency which is in God to bring light out of darkness and good out of evil. The Christian, in obedience to the ideal of love which "endureth all things," will "embrace contentedly whatsoever God doth send him." Like the Stoic, he will not complain or rebel. But he will not stop here, in what may degenerate into a spirit of subservience or surrender. Within himself he feels the ability to transform evil into good. What has come upon him he may use to the advantage of all that he would best serve in life, and therewith turn a liability into an asset, an injury into an advantage. What he suffers he may make a benefit for himself and others through the creative power of his inner life. There is no defeat but only victory, no shame but only glory. For the grace of God dwelleth in him, and this grace it is that brings not merely patience and long-suffering, but the strength and the will to make the Kingdom a living thing among us.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

R. ALFRED HASSLER
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Dorothy Detzer
Eugene Exman
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Amos B. Hulen
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Willis J. King
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Donovan E. Smucker
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

Paul is here our great example. Who suffered more indignities and injustices than he? "Thrice was I beaten with rods," he tell us, "once was I stoned, . . . in perils of my countrymen, . . . in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness," and more than once in prison. But these things he did not lament. He not only endured but "gloried" in them. For he counted them all so much "gain for Christ."

III

These are the two aspects of that religion of which I speak—the two poles, negative and positive, through which pass the currents of the spirit. To endure without complaint and to overcome with joy—this is the essence of that life which every pacifist should live.

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

September 1943 **Vol. IX—No. 9**

"Unconditional Surrender"

By LAURENCE HOUSMAN*

THERE was a time, in the war situation, when the demand for the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers seemed a fantastic proposition. It seems less fantastic now; the material conditions for bringing it about are within the range of possibility. Wishful thinking would put the case in much stronger terms. . . .

But though it has become a possibility is it therefore desirable? Only one thing could make it desirable to those who wish well not only for their own country but for all the suffering nations of the world. Only if the United Nations had the will and the spiritual insight to use their military victory for the good of all—that is, with equal *good will* to all—could unconditional surrender be anything but a danger to the well-being and future peace of the world.

Devastating Results

It is quite evident that the spiritual material for so desirable a conclusion to hostilities does not exist; and that, in the present state of mind of the Allied Nations, the unconditional surrender which they demand as a preliminary to the making of peace would have devastating results for victor and vanquished alike. Though for the former the devastation might not be material, it would certainly be spiritual.

Even when despotism is "benevolent," Lord Acton's dictum that "power always corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" has a good deal to be said for it. When there is no benevolence it is deadly true.

The "knock-out blow" that ended the last war did not merely *lose* us the peace, it murdered it. There is every likelihood of the murder being repeated, if vainglorious self-righteousness remains the dominant note when the fruits of victory fall rotting into the greedy hands and the blind mouths of those in whom mercy and truth have not met together, nor peace and righteousness kissed.

But while we have good reason for fearing what the result for ourselves of the unconditional surrender of our opponents might be, are we not faced with a similar dilemma in the other direction?

If *We* Surrendered

Theoretically, the position of the absolute pacifist is that "unconditional surrender" on our side is better than the continuance of war. Surely we must admit that the spiritual material for making good use of complete victory is just as non-existent among the Axis Powers as among the United Nations. Many, to be honest, would hold that it exists even less.

Unconditional surrender on our part would, therefore, produce the same vast body of evil, spiritual and material, as in the other case. But its incidence would be different. We should lose more decisively, at short range, in things social and political on which we place a high, and perhaps a too boasting, value under the name of "freedom"; for certainly our social and political freedom is not so advanced and uncorrupted as we pretend it to be.

But there is a further reason why unconditional surrender on our part would not have the spiritual value with which pacifist theory seeks to embellish it. To put it quite simply, the material for making it really unconditional is non-existent.

For the "unconditional surrender" which is the pacifist ideal is a *voluntary* surrender made with good will, with a truthful admission of our share in the responsibility for bringing this war about and for having done so little in the past, when we had the power for it, to get rid of the causes of war and to remedy the injustices of an imposed peace. For such a surrender there is no possibility whatever. Why, therefore, talk about it as anything but a dream?

Question of Values

The only reason for talking about it, that I can see, is that it emphasizes the distinction between the value of a world run on power politics, for material ends, and a world run, as it never yet has been run, on the values of a Christian faith which we profess but do not practice.

I will state only one of them quite briefly. A true Christian believes that it is better to be wronged than to do wrong, to suffer than to make others suffer, to be tyrannized over than to tyrannize; that, in the conflict with wrong, there is more hope of salvation in losing one's life voluntarily than in saving it by force. . . .

*Laurence Housman is chairman of the War Resisters International, and author of *Victoria Regina*, etc. This article is reprinted from *Peace News* (British) of July 16, 1943.

The nature and futility of the war become more plainly evident every day. Mr. Muste writes a startling interpretation of what is happening —

As the War Rolls On

By A. J. MUSTE

PACIFISTS often have warned that the war would not solve, but only complicate, our problems, and would lead to profound disappointment. Had they gone so far, however, as to predict in detail the present situation as it is pictured from day to day in such highly respectable and often pro-Administration organs as the *New York Times,* the *New York Post,* the *Nation,* and the *New Republic,* they would have been denounced as madmen or tools of Hitler.

The situation that the "realists" have created is fraught with infinite woe for mankind. At the same time, it is so fantastic and incredible in many of its aspects that in the bitter opening pages of his new book, *Between Tears and Laughter,* Dr. Lin Yutang is moved to say: "Every age has its buffoons and the buffoons make you laugh. Great men make great mistakes and small men make small mistakes. Then the great men love to point out the small mistakes of the small men." He had been referring in the preceding paragraph not to such men as Mussolini, but to Eden, Hull, and Halifax.

The Situation in Italy

Consider the Italian situation when Mussolini resigned and disappeared. Secretary Hull, according to the reporters, had nothing beyond platitudes to contribute. A day later the President, when asked his reaction to the resignation of Il Duce, said he never had any reactions—was too old to have them. The Office of War Information, however, on receipt of the news that the King and Badoglio had replaced Mussolini, announced that "the essential nature of the Fascist regime in Italy had not changed" and spoke of the "moronic little King" and of Badoglio as a "high-ranking Fascist." At almost the same moment General Eisenhower, who has dealt with Darlans, Peyroutons, and Girauds in North Africa, "commended the House of Savoy"; and he seemed to utter the authentic voice of Washington, for the President, despite the fact that he professes to be too old to have reactions, gave the OWI a sound scolding. It had "imperilled the most difficult of international negotiations" as well as the "lives of Allied fighting men."

The President, Churchill, and Amgot (Allied Military Government of Occupied Territories) have made it clear, as Gaetano Salvemini of Harvard charges, that they "are waging in Italy two simultaneous wars. One is aimed at achieving 'unconditional surrender'; the other is aimed at preventing revolution." If Badoglio maintains his connection with Germany, the United Nations will bomb the Italian people; if Badoglio joins the United Nations, the Germans will bomb Italy and, in that case, if the Italians should refuse to submit to Badoglio, Amgot troops would machine-gun them in order to prevent "chaos and anarchy" in Italy!

In the American State Department the man in charge of Italian affairs is subordinate to James Clement Dunn, who has been pro-Franco ever since the Spanish Civil War; and over him is Breckinridge Long, once ambassador to Rome and a professed admirer of Mussolini. The chief civilian aide to General Sir Harold Alexander, in charge of Amgot, is Lord Rennell of Rodd, a former friend of leading reactionary Italians and a partner in Morgan, Grenfell and Company. As the Washington editor of the *Nation* reminds us: "Morgan loans and the Vatican blessing were two of the principal supports of the Fascist regime."

Stalin Dissents

Amgot was set up, it would seem, and the Italian policy adopted, without consultation with Stalin; obviously he dissents vigorously. As a result, the rift between Russia and Great Britain-United States, which has been played down consistently for months, is now in the headlines. Maisky and Litvinov, Russian ambassadors to London and Washington respectively, have been called home. Stalin stays away from the Quebec conference of Roosevelt and Churchill and the press "protests too much" how perfectly natural this is. Moscow complains loudly that the United Nations still have not set up a Second Front in Europe, i.e., that the Russians continue to do the bulk of the fighting against Germany and are entitled to a corresponding voice in the settlement. Through its Committee for Free Poland and other means, Moscow has smashed plans for a Polish-Czech alliance after the war. The Czech President-in-exile, Benes, appears instead to have worked out an alliance with Russia but London, at this writing, is preventing him from going to Moscow to consummate the understanding.

Most important of all, Moscow has sponsored the formation of a "National Committee of Free Germany." This committee on July 21 broadcast an appeal to the German people that merits the closest study. The Germans must overthrow Hitler by a coalition of the army and the people; form a new democratic government, and retire to the borders of the Reich—whether 1933, 1939, or 1941 is not stipulated. Then they may ask for peace that will "once again place Germany on an equal footing with other nations." The new government must pledge internal reforms, including freedom of opportunity to acquire wealth and restoration of property to its rightful owners.

There is public speculation among journalists and commentators close to the heads of the United Nations about

the possibility of a separate peace between Russia and some German regime succeeding Hitler and representing "the army and the people," in spite of the fact that the Russian-British twenty-year treaty provides against such a separate peace.

It requires only very elementary political insight to see that some of Stalin's recent moves can be construed as laying the groundwork for such a development. He might consider it in certain circumstances to be in the national interest of Russia and, in that case, would not hesitate for a moment to adopt the policy. Russia, may, in spite of appearances, be so weak that he would like to pull out and begin rebuilding. He may believe his allies are making Russians and Germans bear the brunt of the blood-letting, so that both may have no choice but to submit in the post-war world to the domination of Great Britain and especially of the fresh forces of the United States; and may prefer an understanding with Germany to this prospect.

What appears more likely at the moment is that the recent Stalinist moves mean two things. First, they serve notice that—the Atlantic Charter notwithstanding—the Baltic countries and Bessarabia will remain Soviet territory and eastern Europe a Soviet sphere of influence. And the British have made up their minds that they probably cannot balk Stalin at this point. Hence, a special dispatch from London to the *New York Times* observes that, "what seemed unreasonable and unethical on Moscow's part in 1939 seems quite proper in the best London clubs today."

Second, Stalin is wooing the German people to put faith in Russia rather than in Great Britain and the United States after the war—to regard a tieup with Russia as at worst the lesser of two evils. Thus our prediction may be fulfilled that some form of Soviet totalitarianism may dominate Eurasia from the Atlantic to the Pacific unless the English-speaking powers are prepared to make or threaten war to prevent it.

China and Self-Interest

Meantime the situation in the Pacific is such that in the book already referred to, Lin Yutang concludes that "China should travel the road with America and England in the next decades as a friendly nation, under two conditions. The first condition is that . . . she will not be accorded true equality until she is like Japan, twenty years from now, when she can build her own tanks and guns and battleships. . . . The second condition is that, while acting as a friendly nation, China must learn the important lesson of acting for national self-interest as Western nations have done and are doing." Moreover, he points out, China is "coming up . . . and nothing the Western nations can do can stop her or keep her down." We may draw our own conclusions as to where national self-interest then may lead her. There seems little reason to hope as things are now going that it will be a very different road from that followed by other empires.

The "Home Front"

And here at home? Before the war's end is in sight the attack on labor has been launched via the Connally-Smith Act and other means, and race riots, also ahead of schedule, warn of the reactionary determination to wipe out the slight gains Negroes have made during the war. As the election campaign draws near, the President continues to retreat, as witness the rebuke to Wallace and the delivery to the State Department of greater power over economic warfare and the Lehman relief organization.

At this moment of global crisis the President has before him a report from his administrative experts describing "conflicting personalities, lack of cohesive policy, and a resulting impairment of the efficiency of the Department of State." Persistent rumors have it that Sumner Welles is to be "kicked upstairs, out of the executive side of the Department" as being too radical! The Washington editor of the ardently pro-war and pro-Administration *Nation* has reached the conclusion that "the whole North African and French policies are the President's. . . . Incredible though it sounds, informed people whom I trust say that . . . the President still thinks another deal with Petain may yet be possible and is prepared even to make a deal with Laval, if anything can be obtained from him."

Men in the high places all talk about a vast military establishment being retained after the war. Government departments find it difficult to get or retain the services of business men who want to concentrate on preparing for profitable "free enterprise" after the war in every quarter of the earth. In view of all this, how can intelligent, progressive, and Christian people continue to support the war? How believe that it can lead to a just and durable peace? The longer the war continues and the forces we have described continue to operate, the more dismal the outlook for mankind.

To the leaders and the people of the United States the only valid summons is: "Pioneer in waging peace at once. 'The democrat should come as a brother; but we are, as we stand, the conqueror and, possibly, the business connection.' Propose an immediate armistice. Send food abroad, not battleships and bombers. Call the peoples everywhere to a great peaceful crusade for democracy and brotherhood—and set the example here at home. Bread, Peace, Democracy—now and forever, one and inseparable."

The campaign of the Peace Strategy Board, supported by various pacifist organizations, demanding a clear statement of peace aims now, should have our united support and prayers.

The Nature of War

With the Second World War already under way, the wise men of the earth are still disputing over who won the first one. Some of these authorities claim the winners lost it while others maintain the losers won it. My own hunch is that whoever won it wished he hadn't. The long and short of it all is that in a world in which the well-being of each part is dependent on the well-being of the whole, war is like sawing off one's leg as a preliminary to growing rich in the crutch business.

Oscar Ameringer.

Acknowledgment

By an oversight there was omitted from the August *Fellowship* acknowledgment of the fact that *Is Earth for Mirth or Martyrdom,* by Sarah Cleghorn, was published by permission of the *Pilgrim Highroad,* in which it first appeared.—*The Editors.*

LABOR DAY, 1943, FINDS ORGANIZED LABOR FACING BOTH ATTACK AND OPPORTUNITY. HERE TWO AUTHORATIVE WRITERS CONSIDER LABOR'S PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALITIES.

1. Labor Today and Tomorrow

By JAMES MYERS

Industrial Secretary, Federal Council of Churches; Author, "Do You Know Labor?"

UNION organization of workers carries both economic and spiritual implications. A Christian employer once declared that he was convinced that no man in a position of authority over other people is morally good enough, nor can he have enough imagination, to give proper consideration to the needs, feelings, and just desires of his employees. For that reason, he said, he was glad that his workers were organized in regular labor unions so that they could deal collectively with him without subservience or fear, and thus save him from any unconscious injustice to them.

It is indeed anomolous that the official in an unorganized concern who makes or most influences decisions about wages and working conditions that affect the whole group, including the lowest paid employees, *is commonly the highest paid person in the entire organization!* It is rather too heavy a strain on his Christian imagination (assuming that he has one) for such a man to make right decisions in these matters, and in any case such a condition is not democracy. The workers themselves should have a voice in these issues that are of immediate and vital importance to their "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness."

This article therefore proceeds on the assumption that religious people, because of their emphasis on the dignity and worth of the common man and on the validity of the democratic principle, are anxious to see an increasingly strong, intelligent, and socially minded labor movement. Let us then take stock of the progress that has been made by American labor and note at least certain trends that may affect its future.

Better But Not Too Good

The past ten years have seen enormous and historic progress for labor in the exercise of its rights to organize. Only fifteen years ago I heard a national church convention reaffirm impressive resolutions about labor's right to organize and went from there directly to where hundreds of coal miners and their families were living in tents in the snow, discharged from their jobs and evicted from their homes for no other reason than that they had attempted, by joining a union, to exercise the very right that the Church had solemnly affirmed.

Since 1935 labor unions have grown from 3,500,000 members, or 10 per cent of the 35,000,000 "organizable" workers, to more than 11,000,000 members, or more than 27½ per cent of the 40,000,000 organizable workers in 1942. The present year has witnessed a further increase.

This enormous growth has as its principal causes the adoption of the National Labor Relations Act, which wrote into the law of the land the right of labor to organize; and the birth of the CIO with its drive for industrial unionism, and the accompanying rejuvenation and growth of many A. F. of L. unions.

However, it needs to be noted that about 72½ per cent of organizable workers still are not members of unions and do not enjoy the protection of collective bargaining. Moreover, even in a time when workers supposedly are receiving high wages, 7,500,000 American workers in 1942 still received less than forty cents an hour and still were "right on the edge of the minimum standards of health and decency or below it." These include many workers in agriculture, fisheries, retail trades, and domestic services, as well as such groups as Negroes and migrants.

War-Time Status of Labor

Modern warfare, with its dependence upon industrial production, may have tended to add, in the eyes of the general public, some dignity and importance to industrial workers as "soldiers of production." On the other hand, the fears and prejudices of war time, which intensify all social conflict, have greatly sharpened the attacks on labor. Under the guise of patriotism and the need of production anti-labor forces have utterly distorted many facts and used labor as a target for all kinds of criticism. Most of this criticism, as in the matter of absenteeism, is utterly unfounded or seriously misleading. What are the facts?

Wages

While long working hours have resulted in an increase of 49 per cent in *weekly* wages in war industries from 1939 to 1942, at the same time the general cost of living rose over 22 per cent and is still going up. The price of food—which looms so large in the industrial worker's budget and on which he must depend for strength to carry on—has skyrocketed beyond all proportion.

With the "Little Steel Formula" of the War Labor Board and the "hold the line" order of President Roosevelt, wage rates have been frozen at not more than 15 per cent above January, 1941, and many millions of workers have not had even that raise. In such cases they have in reality suffered a *cut* in wages equal to the advance in living costs. Add the 20 per cent for taxes now "checked off" from the worker's pay by the government, plus the pressure to buy war bonds, and the result is not by any means the same picture of wage earners rolling in wealth that some newspapers, some employers, and some politicians paint for public consumption. Nor does it soothe the

workers' sense of "equality of sacrifice" nor increase their respect for the Church, when the Committee for Constitutional Government, of which the Rev. Norman Vincent Peale is Chairman, strenuously opposes as unfair the proposal to limit salaries of executives to $25,000 a year!

Working and Living Conditions

Furthermore, war-time working, living, and social conditions for millions of workers are tough. The risk to life and limb in industry is higher than most people realize. In 1942, 18,500 workers were killed in industrial accidents, and 1,750,000 injured, of whom 70,000 were permanently disabled. Accidents caused a loss of 38,000,000 man-days, to say nothing of time lost because of illness. Millions live in deplorable conditions. The war has uprooted hundreds of thousands of workers' families and transplanted them to strange surroundings in distant places. Housing is so inadequate that often two or three families live in one-family units. In some places a worker from each shift keeps the same bed occupied around the clock. Most war plants have three shifts. In many factories women as well as men work on the "graveyard" night shift. Delinquency and prostitution take their toll among children left to care for themselves while father and mother are at the factories, and family separations and divorces have become more and more frequent as a result of abnormal conditions.

Women, old and young, put in long hours at the plant and return home by over-crowded buses, for which they often have long waits at street corners in heat or cold or rain. Tired out, they must then still "do their own work" of housekeeping, feeding the family, caring for the children. Nor does it always add to the family happiness when young boys, employed for the first time, draw down enormous wages for beginners and indulge in a variety of irresponsible actions.

Countless homes never are free of the constant anxiety for sons at the fighting fronts. Wives of soldiers, receiving only fifty dollars a month, often have to break up their homes and "double up with the old folks," thereby adding still more to the strains of living. Out of the irritations and frayed nerves of such living come untold headaches and heartaches.

How different this is from the lure of "high wages" that we read about! A farmer who had tried it for himself told me that he got back to the farm with a sigh of relief. "Let them have their high wages," he said. "I don't want to have to live like that."

Legislative Repression

Ignoring all this, and disregarding the magnificent production record of American workers and the amazingly small time lost by strikes (6/100ths of 1 per cent in 1942), Congress adopted the Connally-Smith Act, which adds an element of insult by implying that a particular class requires criminal restraints. This Act, which has many ramifications, cannot be discussed here in detail. Personally I would favor certain legislation regulating unions and all other unincorporated associations, but the Connally-Smith Act has all the wrong answers and fails to incorporate the right ones.

Those who favored the Connally-Smith Act already talk of adopting an even harsher law which, together with the proposed Austin-Wadsworth Labor Conscription Act, would constitute another step in America toward the nazi and fascist concept of compulsory labor. History is full of illustrations of the eventual adoption, by military conquerors, of the worst features of the enemy's culture, which it was their professed intention to stamp out by military might. Let us hope that it won't happen here!

Labor, What Now?

Faced with the present situation, it would seem reasonable to predict—and the signs already are apparent—that American labor will turn increasingly to political action. It is to be hoped that it will turn vigorously to consumer cooperation as well. The CIO already has announced a nation-wide campaign of political action reaching down into the smallest community unit, and the A. F. of L. Executive Committee in August voted a similar drive.

Probably both will confine themselves in 1943 and 1944 to the old line of "rewarding your friends and punishing your enemies," but indications also exist of a ground swell toward an independent labor, or labor-farmer, political party. There are some unions whose political philosophy begins and ends in the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt. They have already come out for a fourth term. Others, realizing that one man cannot live forever and seeing the coalition of reactionary Southern Democrats with conservative Republicans, increasingly feel the need of an independent political party in the not distant future. The existence of the American Labor Party in New York State, and the growing trends toward labor political organization in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Michigan are significant.

Some years ago there were approaches made between politically minded labor groups, the Farmers' Union, and Farmer-Labor Party in the Midwest, looking toward a farmer-labor national party. It seems doubtful that such a consummation will occur in the immediate future, but it may well be in the picture for the coming years.

Consumer Cooperation

Labor groups have developed also a significant interest in consumer cooperation. The position of labor today is not far different from that of the farmers about 1920, when the latter finally realized that all their strong farm organizations and all their efforts to increase the prices of their products did not get them anywhere in view of the increased prices of the things they had to buy. At that point of economic frustration the farmers turned to consumer cooperation, by means of which they have substantially controlled their cost of living, and have acquired cooperative ownership of many industries that supply their basic needs.

Organized labor today is in a similar position, with large, strong organizations, personnel, and financial resources but, economically speaking, "no place to go" except as it turns to the cooperative movement. The increasing insistence of national labor leaders on control of the cost of living; the appointments by both the A. F. of L. and the CIO of special committees on cooperatives;

the engaging of Donald Montgomery, consumer and co-operative expert, on full time by the United Automobile Workers of the CIO; the building of cooperative stores by labor groups in various places, including some of the new defense housing units; all these are straws in the wind that may indicate a labor movement with a broader vision of the welfare of all the people, economically achieved largely through cooperative ownership.

Labor and the Post-War World

There are current two contradictory prophecies concerning the status of labor after the war. Some people predict that "labor will be in the saddle and running (or riding) everything." Others predict that the reactionary trend, which already has appeared in Congress, will seriously weaken, if it does not completely smash, labor after the war, exactly as happened after the last war.

Probably neither of these predictions is correct. There can be no question of the country's reactionary trend, but on the other hand organized labor never in its history has been so strong as now, and may hold its own in public life to a far greater degree than after the last war. The systematic publication by the press of letters from front-line soldiers condemning labor for strikes and on other issues gives a quite false impression. Other soldiers, whose letters can be found only in labor union papers, express as strongly their firm belief in the labor movement as the principal guarantee of democracy at home and the chief hope for a decent world after the war. Indeed, the larger proportion of union members among returning soldiers after this war may influence even the policies of the new American Legion!

Spiritual Factors

The role of labor in the future will depend partly on external forces and circumstances, and partly on internal factors in the labor movement itself. While the working class probably is the most natural carrier of social justice and the greatest potential force toward a decent social order, membership in the working class does not automatically make one an angel. While organized labor has moved ahead of the Church and other institutions as a practical force in most social reforms, not all unions, for instance, are yet fair to Negroes or to Americans of Japanese ancestry; too few have effective workers' education programs, which must be the foundation of intelligent, progressive unionism and its leadership for tomorrow; a few are dishonestly led; many are still nationalistic, emphasizing high tariffs and other selfish attitudes. Moreover, many have not yet realized that the war system for settling international disputes is itself a major enemy of humanity, and that for it must be substituted the orderly procedure of world government, and a just and durable peace. There are indeed encouraging trends and definite movements in union circles toward these broad social goals, including special commissions on post-war reconstruction, and the American Labor Conference on International Affairs. Yet thoughtful union leaders will agree that probably the deepest need of the American labor movement if it is to fulfill its high calling, is essentially spiritual. It is the need of a still broader vision of life as a whole, with its spiritual as well as its economic values; it is the need of a still more passionate desire for the common welfare of all mankind. It is, I suspect, the same basic need that you and I find in our souls.

---

2. Labor After the War

By WALTER G. MUELDER

Professor of Christian Ethics, University of Southern California

IN war time the peace is being made. What are the prospects for the labor movement in the post-war world? Will organized labor play a leading role in the new era? Is there adequate leadership or power capable of determining the shape of things to come?

Nationalism, opportunism, racialism, and sectarianism are among the acute problems of the labor movement in America-at-war. Intensifying these, and throwing the labor movement on the defensive are the attacks on social legislation, the lowering of child labor standards, the mobility and migration of workers, the problem of maintaining wage scales commensurate with rising costs of living, the increased number of women in industry, labor pirating, discrimination against Negroes and other racial minorities, bad housing conditions, threats of outright labor conscription, legislation like the Connally-Smith Act, and general confusion in war labor policies.

Each of these problems is acute and each tends to be all-absorbing, assuming temporarily great psychological proportions, in war time. But the period following hostilities will be more affected by the long-time trends, policies, and stage of philosophical maturity of organized labor than by the tactics or success in meeting any particular present need. On these more permanent factors this discussion will concentrate. They are well known but need repeated emphasis.

Racial Cooperation

Of acute present importance, and of long-range significance as well, is the issue of racial cooperation and integration in the labor movement. Daily the treatment accorded workers of minority races in the United States becomes more fatefully entangled with the prospects of a

successful peace settlement. No policy can be considered realistic that fails to recognize the basic quality of racial groups in their claims for social justice. Therefore, the gradient of honest integration must be stepped up at once if labor chaos and enmity with exceeding bitterness are to be avoided.

Unions have improved somewhat in their attitudes toward Negroes. In many instances the change in policy is in response to the external pressure stemming from Executive Order No. 8802. Such shifts in policy are likely to be fleeting. Real progress comes when unions voluntarily announce their willingness to integrate Negroes into the total program of organized labor.

The still-dominant pattern of discrimination against Negroes affects not only present labor shortages and unemployment, but also Negro morale and the relations of the federal government to our colored allies. In some centers like Los Angeles, A. F. of L. leaders actively sponsor resolutions against both Chinese and Japanese, resist the pressure for improvement of Negro and Mexican labor relations, and even collaborate with reactionary local groups on these issues. The problems cannot, of course, be solved by labor alone, but the need for a deeper insight into an all-inclusive racial policy is hard to exaggerate.

A Mature Social Philosophy

If labor is to lead creatively after hostilities cease, the organized movement must mature rapidly in its social philosophy. American unionism on the whole has been a protective device for journeymen in their efforts at collective bargaining. The protection is still important to conserve, but the social philosophy supporting it is inadequate in the face of radical changes in the social process.

The tradition of the A. F. of L. has been that of guarding the rights of skilled trades within the "American system." Clinging to the traditions of skill in the midst of an advancing technology that steadily has undermined the dominance of skill in industry, much effort had gone into claiming jurisdiction over work formerly done, in spite of the changes in materials and technology.

The pressures of the war in production call for a reconsideration of the concept of skilled labor and hence for a more sympathetic appreciation of the relation of the craft unionist to the "unskilled" masses of workers. To some degree the needed adjustments are being made, due in part to the struggle between the A. F. of L. and the CIO, but the adjustments are only in their initial stages. Leadership for the future depends greatly on a modern philosophy of the relations of technology to the masses of workers.

A modern philosophy of labor will envisage a greater measure of democratic freedom for workers within unions. Friends of labor, like Norman Thomas, have urged a Bill of Rights for workers. It is important now that membership in an appropriate union ought to be without discrimination by reason of race, country of origin, color, creed, or sex, and without the barrier of unreasonably high initiation fees. Unions should guarantee to their members fair elections, regularly organized conventions at reasonable intervals, full financial and other information on union affairs, and free discussion of those affairs. Unions should also insure fair, orderly, and impartial trial of all charges involving union discipline, and they should assure that the discipline of the unions will not be used as a weapon for racketeering, factional or dictatorial control. Finally, there should be fair treatment in job placement insofar as that is a function of the union.

Changes in Basic Pattern

Reform within the unions, along the lines just suggested, will affect greatly all their social relations. But such reform will not of itself change the basic ideological pattern of both major union groups. That pattern is "bargaining unionism." Leftist ideology has not been, and is not now, dominant.

Bargaining unionism as a philosophy assumes a set of social relations that rapidly are becoming obsolete. The present crisis calls for a deeper social insight than that manifested in the power conflicts of bargaining unionists among themselves and between them and management. Jurisdictional and other competitive struggles for status within capitalism absorb the attention of a leadership capable of greater things.

The contests over relative bargaining positions in industry threaten the very basis of labor power in federal law. Because of the disputes between the Federation and the CIO in the Kaiser shipyards, the A. F. of L. is pressing for passage of amendments to the Wagner Act which it regards as favorable to itself, even though opening the floodgates for amendments to fundamental legislation at the present time may result in jeopardizing the whole organized labor movement!

During the present war labor unions have been put on the defensive by their bargaining opponent. So long as reactionary corporations have not accepted the principle of collective bargaining, and conduct their industrial relations with an eye to its early removal, unions are forced to take up the struggle for democracy at that level.

Labor on the War Boards

The public needs to insist that labor participate with at least equal power on all war boards where its interests have a functional share. Walter Reuther and Philip Murray have demonstrated that labor can do sound industry-wide planning. Through a longer period Sidney Hillman has shown that workers sometimes understand the problems of an industry better than management. It is a crime against the future that so much of workers' vitality and creativity has to go into holding gains previously made, in resisting reactionary legislation, and in striving for elementary status on federal and local control boards. Bargaining rights must be conserved in order that energy may flow into more creative projects.

There is ample evidence that labor equals capital in capacity to do industry-wide planning. The Twentieth Century Fund book, *How Collective Bargaining Works,* concludes: "Industry-wide collective bargaining seems a logical next step. . . . It makes for greater stability throughout an industry, more responsible unions, and puts management on a more fair and equitable competitive basis so far as wage costs are concerned." Looking ahead, the report notes a strong tendency "for agreements to cover a wide geographical area . . . regional and national agreements are increasing."

It is a distinct gain that the CIO and the A. F. of L. are collaborating more today than ever before. Philip Murray has indicated that the former is joining with the latter, the Railway Brotherhoods, and the Farmers' Union in a common legislative drive to fight anti-labor legislation. Labor has served notice that it is out to defeat every member of Congress who voted for the Connally-Smith Act. This Act, a possible forerunner of even more drastic legislation, provides for supervision of strike votes, fines and imprisonment for those instigating strikes in war plants operated or seized by the government, registration of unions, the filing of data on their finances, and the prohibition of union contributions to political parties.

No Basic Unity

Despite the projected unity to fight the Connally-Smith legislation, no basic labor unity is in sight. The United Mine Workers have turned their backs on the CIO, the United Automobile Workers and the United Rubber Workers seem to be unsettled about their affiliations, the International Ladies Garment Workers are still outside both major groups, and the International Association of Machinists has withdrawn from the A. F. of L. There remains throughout the whole process a dead weight of traditional social philosophy, the opportunism of bargaining status. This makes for a false view of the so-called "harmony of interests" between the bargainers and plays into the hands of a philosophy of vested interest in the "free enterprise" system. Such an outlook may support resistance to much needed revaluations and changes in the political and economic process.

The outlook is dark for American labor leadership in the social order of the immediate future because of its unrealistic relation to politics. Labor owes much to politics, but the labor movement has not learned independent political action. The Clayton Act provided that the "labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce." The Norris-LaGuardia Act marked the milestone of recognition that the corporate structure of the economic order required a corporate form of labor relations and recognized that "the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor." The NRA and the National Labor Relations Act guaranteed to workers "unions of their own choosing."

On the basis of this history it ought to become clear to workers that political action is essential to the development of economic democracy, and it ought to suggest the constructive possibility of independent political action. But the philosophy of simple bargaining unionism bars the way.

The reception that labor has had in war-time Washington makes plainer the need for independent political action. Had labor at the present time political power commensurate with its just economic due in the war economy, the nation would not now be plagued with such a mass of reactionary social pressure and social privilege. The deluge of abuse heaped upon the American "Beveridge Report" and upon Mr. Lewis are a good index, along with the passage of the Connally-Smith Act, of the confidence that can be entrusted to the major political parties.

The coal conflict has been called correctly a "nightmare of confusion, bureaucratic competition, false starts and sudden reversals." At a time when the Labor Department, the Conciliation Service, the War Labor Board, the Office of Price Administration, and other governmental agencies and heads demonstrate an inability to coordinate the war labor program, organized labor finds itself relatively unable to do anything about it. Independent political action would not eradicate these evils, but labor would be less defensive if it had more political leadership in its own hands, especially if that political leadership were the expression of an adequate social philosophy to which the masses of American workers had been wholeheartedly educated.

In recent years the trend of constructive labor legislation has been slowly upward, but the present situation shows that much is left to be desired. Vice-President Wallace has said that powerful "American fascists" were sniping at the progressive domestic program of the last ten years. The course of new laws in the United States causes a tragic delay or lag between the appearance of new problems and the legislative treatment of them. The sorry plight of thousands of munitions, agricultural, and migratory workers testifies to the lack of adequate legislation. When one considers the opportunities that employers have and use of controlling legislative bodies and blocking the enforcement of law, and when one considers the meager assistance handed out by step-motherly political parties, one is amazed at the lack of political militancy on the part of workers. Of all major Western industrial nations the United States has been the most backward in protecting the wage earner.

A tremendous political struggle lies immediately before the American people with respect to the proposed "expanded Social Security system" as developed by the National Resources Planning Board. Senator Robert F. Wagner, with Senator James E. Murray as co-sponsor, has introduced S. 1161, a measure which is in general accord with the proposals of the Board, except that there are no references to public works or to a youth program. The social security provisions, however, are quite advanced. Both the CIO and the A. F. of L. have endorsed the bill, but the passage of this much-needed legislation lies in the hands of a Congressional leadership that has shown little appreciation for the kind of world that the common man seeks. If, through good fortune, the legislation is passed and the basic outlines of NRPB are adhered to, many of the most chaotic, reactionary, and revolutionary dangers of the immediate post-war period may be avoided.

Growing Political Insight

There is evidence that certain labor leaders and some of the general membership of unions are growing in political insight. Questionnaires given to students of the Minneapolis Labor Union Center, the Milwaukee Labor College, and Highlander Folk School showed significant results in the returns:

Seventy-nine per cent said that labor can't get and keep good wages and working conditions unless they elect public officials who are sympathetic to them. Seventy-one per cent said that the main reason why workers are not better off is that labor unions don't have as much influence in political circles as employers and business men do. Seventy-six per

cent held that workers are affected more directly than owners by what happens in a plant, and so workers should try to become powerful enough to help decide how the plant should be managed. And seventy per cent believed that the majority of the people in this country would be better off if we had a strong Farmer-Labor party to compete with the other political parties. (See Th. Brameld, ed., *Workers' Education in the United States,* p. 163.)

Leadership in the post-war world is unthinkable apart from political power. Since the new era will be characterized by greater political centralization, the controls must be democratically effective. Among these democratic controls workers must be responsibly represented. Otherwise, governments and even world government, under the pressure of special privilege, will outmaneuver the popular will. Moreover, the proposed economic freedoms are dependent for their effective realization upon political instruments. If there is to be a "people's world" there must be functioning an international cooperation of workers' and consumers' groups. Today, however, workers' organizations are no more united internationally than are the governments of the United Nations; actually, less so. American workers are still too afraid of words like "communism" and "socialism." One important branch of organized labor has stood aloof from discussions of war problems with Russian workers. This is a serious handicap.

Must Look Beyond America

It appears that the prospects of liberal and left-wing labor activity in America will be determined primarily by the domestic situation. This condition stands in marked contrast to England, where the labor groups' attitudes will be largely influenced by the state of the British Commonwealth generally and by the position of Russia at the end of the war. In America more attention deserves to be given to the ideals of Philip Murray in this connection: "With the war period, the very things for which the CIO and unions generally have been formed are the things for which the entire nation and its allies are now fighting." The most comprehensive, dynamic, and forward-looking program of labor action and education for the post-war period is that just made public by the Textile Workers Union of America under the title, *Towards a New Day.* It draws skillfully upon the best thinking in constructive circles. Moreover, it recognizes that "our fight must be on the political front, political action must be the order of the day."

A significant step is the formation of the American Labor Conference on International Affairs, comprised jointly of the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the Railway Brotherhoods. Its function is to study the problem of the conduct of the war and the future peace from the point of view of labor. On the executive committee are some ranking leaders, along with Raphael Abramovitch of the Labor and Socialist International and Dr. James T. Shotwell of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The new organization plans an educational campaign on international affairs among organized labor groups and will publish studies.

In all lands it is urgent that labor and left-wing movements come to a meeting of minds and action along racial, economic, and political fronts. Indeed, many already are impatient with old conflicts, like those between the Second and Third Internationals. And yet the barriers to labor and socialist unity internationally seem even more insurmountable since the deaths of Henryk Erlich and Victor Alter. The admission by Maxim Litvinov of their execution at the hands of Stalin's government has severely shocked the labor and socialist world. Fears of "Stalinism," thus revived, thwart wholehearted cooperation. Even the dissolution of the Comintern does not substantially improve the situation. The execution lifts again into the foreground the problem of ends and means. The means determine the end. Means and ends are so indissolubly joined that the betrayal of democratic means nullifies the projected end.

If labor groups are to unite the world around, there must emerge a common faith in democratic and nonviolent means. Mutuality is not merely a matter of common ends, but basically of the way and the spirit in which these are sought. The workers of the world need greater and more frequent consultation and collaboration to clarify the kind of world they really want. They need deeper insight as to what kind of social order the moral grain of the universe will tolerate. This brings us to a final point, the matter of workers' education.

Labor Schools Needed

The American labor movement has not keenly enough appreciated the need for year-round schools and for well-rounded curricula. The A. F. of L. has not sufficiently understood the social dynamics of the economic order in which it and the CIO are now, for good or ill, the chief organized bearers of economic democracy. For the most part the former's educational programs have sought to teach workers how to share "through organization by understanding and, on the whole, accepting the major premises of our traditional business economy." The CIO has been more inclined to regard "organized labor as an aggressive agency of social redirection." But there is little evidence that the movement as a whole has sensed the urgency of preparing workers adequately for militant leadership at home and for world-wide responsibility. They are unprepared to answer the question: What kind of a world do we really want?

Pacifists Look at Labor

"We have no illusions about unionism as an institution being perfect. There are undemocratic practices in various labor unions just as there are such practices in business, politics, and religion. But, given our present economic system with its continued struggle between the privileged and the dispossessed classes, we feel that labor unionism is a potent vehicle to bring about greater justice to the masses of the people. We are not concerned only with wages, hours, and working conditions. We believe that a strong democratic labor union movement can be a force which will check the tendency toward undemocratic economic collectivism."

From *Pacifists Facing World Problems,*
by the Chicago FOR study group.

News from the Peace Front

Investigate Charges of Brutal Treatment of COs

As *Fellowship* went to press, a letter received from Stanley Murphy charges that on August 3 he was severely beaten by two attendants for refusal to work. He adds that a "grapevine" message from Lewis Taylor conveys the news that Taylor has been "badly beaten." Murphy believes that his friend has resumed his hunger strike and is being force-fed.

Charges of brutal treatment of two imprisoned conscientious objectors, made by the mother of one of them, have led to the authorization of an investigation of the prison involved by Austin McCormick, nationally known prison authority.

The charges were made by Mrs. Elizabeth Murphy after a visit to her son, Stanley, who is confined in the federal prison hospital at Springfield, Missouri. Mrs. Murphy asserted that her son was confined naked in one of the prison's "strip cells," which, she asserted, "have no beds, chairs, wash-basins, or toilets, and only have a hole in the floor" for sanitary facilities. Exercise and recreation out of the cell, she stated, were limited to three minutes a week.

Lewis Taylor, who was transferred with Murphy from the Danbury (Conn.) prison after the two men had finished an 82-day hunger strike, was said by Mrs. Murphy to be in the "insane ward," although prison authorities have stated that the men are not "psychotic, or psychopathic, or physically ill."

Mrs. Murphy's charges were published in the New York *World-Telegram* on August 4, which published at the same time the statement that "the charges were promptly and categorically denied" by James V. Bennett, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Mr. Bennett asserted that "the men are not on psychotic status, and not in solitary, and not in a strip cell and not under punishment."

However, on August 6, in answer to a letter of inquiry from *Fellowship,* Mr. Bennett admitted that both men had been in strip cells for "a short period," but declared that they had "solicited assignment" to the cells. The institutional authorities, he added, "acceded to the requests of these prisoners in this respect, believing this to be the best method of therapy," but "when it became obvious that their behavior was merely for the purpose of gaining publicity for their cases" they were transferred to ordinary hospital rooms. Here, the prison head said, they are held "in separate rooms" but not in solitary confinement cells.

Mounting protests by pacifists and other concerned individuals were met by the appointment of Mr. McCormick. The former Commissioner of Correction for New York City, now head of the Osborne Association, a private organization devoted to prison reform, left New York for Springfield August 10.

Prison Farm?

Surely the Federal Bureau of Prisons is now in a position to recognize and acknowledge the difference that in fact exists between COs and other prison inmates. Since under the present law it seems necessary to imprison men for conscience' sake, and since it is impossible, without senseless and futile punishments, to treat them as though they were "criminals" in the usual sense of that word, it is high time the authorities devised some other means of dealing with these men.

Why not a separate prison farm, cooperatively run by COs under a bare minimum of outside regulation? They are men of honor and integrity whose word can be trusted. Under such conditions they would largely support themselves by their industry and would no longer embarrass and confuse the regular prison routines. Thus the occasion for unnecessary and disgraceful brutality would be lacking.

That Mr. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, has volunteered to authorize an investigation is a clear indication of the sincerity of his motives. It is highly commendable that he has agreed to the suggestion to send Austin McCormick as an impartial investigator.

It is my sincere expectation, based upon several years of acquaintance both with Mr. Bennett and with Mr. McCormick, that the facts will be fully presented and that prompt action will be taken better to solve the problem of dealing with COs who, for reasons of conscience, must refuse to conform to certain rules and are thereby subjected to forms of discipline devised to deal with a very differently motivated resistance.

We await with unflagging interest the findings of this report and the action that shall be taken upon it.

ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR.
FOR Nat'l Chairman.

Springfield Case Focuses Attention on Other Prisons

The case of Stanley Murphy and Lewis Taylor located in the Springfield, Missouri, federal prison hospital, focussed the attention of pacifists in dramatic fashion on the conscientious objectors now confined in twenty-two federal prisons. Including some 500 Jehovah's Witnesses there are said to be more than 1,700 such men, with 250 per month being sentenced.

The story of their treatment varies from prison to prison, and from man to man. Most of the objectors so far appear to have adjusted themselves with a minimum of friction to prison routine, and apparently have no complaints to make in regard to their treatment. On the other hand, an increasing number have come into sharp conflict with prison administrations on various issues, and in some prisons there is evidence that tension is rising.

Thirteen objectors in the Lewisburg (Pa.) prison launched a collective protest against racial segregation by refusing to eat in the segregated dining room. Although the result of this move eventually was to reduce the men's strength to the point where they were unable to work, they assert that they did not actually refuse either to eat or to work at any time.

A visitor to one of the men in this move wrote that after several days without food made them "too weak to work," the authorities put them "in isolation, in 'the hole' (solitary confinement) each one alone." Later, this account added, the thirteen were removed to a separate dormitory where they were held in "joint isolation."

"Solitary," this visitor's letter said, was described by one of the men as "a small room with board for bed (some didn't even have a board), some drinking water, some toilet facilities, a tiny high window and a light on *continually.* He was stripped completely. . . . Food consisted of a bowl of 'slop' a couple of times a day."

Other reports have indicated clashes between imprisoned conscientious objectors and prison authorities in Tallahassee, Florida, Mill Point, W. Va., and Danbury, Conn. In the last-named prison some twenty men were believed to have launched a work-strike protest against race segregation on August 11, although no further news was forthcoming as this issue went to press. The men had not asked complete elimination of segregation, but only that one table in the dining-room be open to any of either race who wished to sit there.

Needed

Several libraries recently have requested back issues of *Fellowship* for their reference files. Readers who would like to contribute copies, from Vol. 1 to the present, are urged to let us know which numbers they have available.

Editorial Comment

COs in Prison

However well-grounded may be the charge of bad treatment of COs in prison, there are two things about which Fellowship members may well continue to voice their concern to their Congressmen, the President, General Hershey, and Attorney General Biddle.

Today, there are several hundred more men in prison for conscience' sake in this country than there were during the last war. Scores of them are men who were eager to render alternative service and who are admittedly sincere COs, but who are ruled not to be entitled to consideration on grounds of "*religious* training and belief." We need to keep the record clear that we cannot be satisfied with less than complete exemption for so-called absolutists and that we cannot as Christians or believers in democracy acquiesce in discrimination against any sincere conscientious objector to all war. "Religious" men least of all will want to accept privilege based on such discrimination.

Secondly, the parole situation remains most unsatisfactory. There is reason to believe that COs are informed that parole depends on their renouncing their convictions. However that may be, it seems clear that COs are not receiving the same opportunities for parole as ordinary law offenders, not to mention the treatment not infrequently accorded to political offenders by governments that make no pretense of being democratic. And why would it not be in the public interest, when there is such a tragic shortage of manpower in many places, to make use of the public service that COs often are equipped to render, rather than keeping them in prison?

Forward to Brotherhood

The Harlem riot, which had the race situation as its background though all competent observers agree that it did not take the form of fighting between Negroes and whites, adds another to a long list of incidents taking place "ahead of schedule," before the war is over, and warning of the fearful social conflicts that will characterize the post-war period unless the most thorough-going and comprehensive measures are taken to prevent them.

Basically there is only one way to deal with conflict situations that have begotten tension, fear, and embitterment. It is to put an end to the injustice, the discrimination, the exploitation inherent in the situation. The one hope of lessening race tension—coming through the situation in which we now are with a minimum of pain and social cost—is for progressive and liberal elements among both the majority and the various minority groups in this country to refuse to be kept or placed on the defensive. Instead they must take the initiative away from the stand-patters, the reactionaries, the racists, the potential fascists. Often we have been on the defensive, in spite of the fact that it is we, not they, who stand on the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Gettysburg Address, the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, on all reputable modern science, and on the decent instincts of human beings everywhere.

Let us inaugurate a great effort for the prompt achievement of a peaceful victory for complete democracy in relations between the races in our own land. Let us ask President Roosevelt to address the nation on the issue. Let the churches unequivocally proclaim as their platform that in Christian and democratic teachings there is no basis for segregation or Jim Crow of any kind, no basis for anything but complete brotherhood. Let us have a national campaign for abolition of Jim Crow in the armed forces of the United States; a national Civil Rights Bill or Fair Racial Practices Act such as Carey McWilliams proposes in his invaluable new book, *Brothers Under the Skin;* abolition of the poll tax; revitalizing of the Fair Employment Practices Committee; repeal of Oriental exclusion legislation; and prompt relocation of Americans of Japanese descent in adequate jobs and hospitable communities.

IFOR News

Eva Hermann, of Mannheim, Germany, a Fellowship member for many years, has been sent to a prison or concentration camp, according to *The Friend* (London) of July 9, 1943. The same magazine tells of a visit to Germany last March by Felix Ansermoz of the Friends Center at Geneva. He speaks of the presence of *Charles House,* from the American Farm School near Salonika, in the civil internment camp at Laufen, near Salzburg, and tells of the Meeting for Worship held by nine persons there "after half an hour of the deepest and most stirring silence I have ever experienced."

Reading for Your Friends—

Our job is not alone informing ourselves of the issues of the day; we must also help to keep the public informed. One way is by distribution of leaflets and pamphlets to friends, Sunday school classes, etc. Here are some good ones.

WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE THE WAR END TODAY?
A new leaflet urging publication of immediate peace aims. Includes petition form. 50 cents per 100 copies.

ONE OF THESE LITTLE ONES
Another winter threatens the starving children of Europe. We must *make every effort to feed them. 5 cents each.*

WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES ABOUT FREEDOM
A. J. Muste's new pamphlet on America's No. 1 Problem—Jim Crow. 5 cents each.

SHALL WE RULE GERMANY?
Oswald Garrison Villard explodes some misconceptions. 10 cents each; 3 copies, 25 cents; 15 copies for $1.00.

LABOR TODAY AND TOMORROW
Reprints of James Myers' informative article in Fellowship. *5 cents per copy; 30 copies, $1.00; 100 copies, $2.50.*

SCHOOL CHILDREN AND THE WAR
Excellent for teachers and parents as school opens. $1.50 per 100.

TRUE OR FALSE?
HELP WANTED — URGENT!
Leaflets presenting challenge to join the Forerunners. For young people of high school age. 25 cents per 100.

Literature Department, Fellowship of Reconciliation
2929 Broadway **New York, 25, N. Y.**

Newspaper Attacks Pacifist Groups

Under a flaring front-page headline *"Exposing*—Drive Within U. S. To Sabotage Unconditional Surrender," the New York City newspaper *PM* devoted two full pages of its Sunday, August 15, edition, to an attack on the National Council for Prevention of War, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and pacifists generally.

Linking the "peace now" campaign of recognized pacifist and church groups with the "appeasement" policies of isolationists and "paid agents of Hitler," *PM* attempted to tar all with the same brush.

"Open advocacy of negotiated peace now comes close to treason," it declared editorially, adding that "Hitler's agents know this and so they remain anonymous when they distribute leaflets and stir up talk about a negotiated peace." Pacifists, the paper conceded, "may not know it so well. Pacifists can be guileless innocents while doing the devil's work. Or their simple faith can leave them forever blind to the lessons of history."

NCPW Chief Target

Frederick J. Libby and the National Council for Prevention of War were chief targets of the attack, with Representative Clare Hoffman, of Michigan. The Fellowship of Reconciliation was mentioned in connection with a new leaflet just issued by the Peace Strategy Board and jointly sponsored by the FOR, the NCPW, and the War Resisters League. The leaflet is captioned "Would you like to see the war end today?" and urges the publication of immediate peace aims.

Throughout the two-page diatribe there was no mention of the constructive alternatives to war proposed by the pacifist groups, nor of the actual basis for negotiations which they favor. Instead, the whole effort was to link pacifist efforts with those of undercover agents of the Axis.

Epidemics Hit Greece

Raging tubercular ailments, 1,500,000 persons suffering from malaria, and a prevalence of "dropsy and unhealing wounds"—these are the conditions now existing in Greece, according to Emil Schram, chairman of the New York Committee of the National War Fund. Half a million children under fourteen, he declared, are in need of basic food and clothing.

Three more colleges which have made no application for an army or navy training center are McPherson College, McPherson, Kansas; Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa; and Guilford College, Guilford, N. C.

Caleb Foote Sentenced

Caleb Foote, FOR secretary for Northern California, was sentenced to six months in a road camp for refusal to report for induction to CPS camp. He was sentenced on July 26 by Federal Judge Louis Goodman who described the need for sentencing Caleb as "extremely distasteful," but declared that he had no alternative. Caleb will serve his "time" at McNeil Island.

Muste Warns of New Conscription Drive

Pacifists and "all friends of democracy" were urged to resist a new drive toward total conscription of both labor and women, in a statement released August 16 by A. J. Muste, secretary of the FOR and treasurer of the National Committee on the Conscription of Women.

Citing the fact that such pro-Administration newpapers as the *New York Post* are "clamoring for passage of the Austin-Wadsworth Bill," Mr. Muste called on opponents of such legislation to make their feelings known to the President, to Robert Reynolds and Andrew J. May, chairmen respectively of the Senate and House Military Affairs committees, and to their own senators and representatives.

"Take the matter up in your churches and clubs, and in conversations with your neighbors," the statement continued. "Remember that so far the labor organizations and the Roman Catholic Church have opposed the measure strongly."

The Committee on Conscription of Women, now making a drive for "badly needed funds for the fall campaign," has as co-chairmen Dr. Georgia Harkness, Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce, and Mrs. Allan Knight Chalmers. Mildred Scott Olmsted is executive secretary.

FOR "Friendly Gesture" Blocked by Sheriff

An attempt to clean up a neglected Japanese-American cemetery, intended by members of the Portland (Oregon) FOR as a "gesture of friendliness" to former neighbors now in Relocation Centers, was frustrated by law enforcement officers and American Legionnaires.

The clean-up campaign, scheduled for Saturday, August 14, was to have preceded observance of the traditional "bon matsuri" ceremonial for the dead the following day. The 35-year old cemetery had become weed-grown and unkempt since evacuation, and half of the 500 grave-markers had been tipped over by vandals.

A story about the Fellowship plans in the local press brought protests from Legionnaires, lodge officials, and others. The sheriff and county district attorney with about 20 officers were present at the cemetery at the hour the campaign was scheduled to begin, along with ranking city and county Legion officials.

Howard Willits, leader of the Fellowship group and first to arrive, attempted for more than an hour to dissuade the law enforcement officers and Legionnaires and then walked into the cemetery and began pulling up weeds, unmolested. However, later arrivals were refused admission by Legionnaires who blocked the entrance.

Sheriff Martin T. Pratt, who threatened arrest if the Fellowship members attempted to enter the cemetery against the wishes of the crowd, was said by the Portland *Oregonian* to have expressed fears that a "riot" would result. However, when Fellowship members asked whether the ban would hold for Sunday also, he declared that "This rule applies now and forever as far as this group is concerned."

"Sympathies of the enforcement officers," added the *Oregonian,* "were obviously with the Legionnaires and they made no effort to halt the heckling" of Fellowship members.

Service Openings

Fellowship accepts no paid advertising. However, with the advent of grave manpower shortages, we are glad to bring to our readers' attention certain needs in this field of which we have been advised. These are listed for their informational value; no investigation of the facts has been made.

Church of All Nations, Lowell, Mass., needs a Christian couple to develop livestock, agriculture and forest on church-owned fresh air farm. Write Rev. L. C. Bockes, R. D. No. 2, Hudson, N. H.

Hamilton County Tuberculosis Hospital (Cincinnati, O.), is in critical need of nursing personnel, men and women, trained and untrained. Closing a section of hospital in sight unless help located. Salary starts at $55 per month plus full maintenance.

White's Manual Labor Institute, Wabash, Ind., needs employees. Owned and managed by Friends Indiana Yearly Meeting, it is co-ed institution for "dependent, neglected, and problem children" with an enrollment of 225. Write Sup't. P. W. Bond for information.

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.; *Midwest:* (Not yet filled), 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Jean G. McKay, 1625 Buchanan Street, San Francisco, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 440 East 13th Avenue, Denver 3, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Merom, Ind.; *Refugee:* Marion Frenyear, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

Pro and Con

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

COs in Prison

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I was concerned to read in the August *Fellowship* of the "coercive measures" used toward some of the COs in prison. Where discrimination is practiced toward COs we have a right and duty to protest. However, we should be certain first that discrimination *is* being practiced; and we should not, it seems to me, ask that COs be granted special privilege denied to other prisoners.

In commenting on the Lewisburg prison, the warden is quoted as having said to one of the men that, "When you came inside those gates you left all your rights behind!" This statement applies not only to COs, but to *every* man who enters a state or federal prison. All rights and privileges are granted to each prisoner by the warden of the prison, and may be taken away by him. If we want to protest against this system that is one thing. But let us protest in the name of all prisoners—not just the COs.

My husband is in a federal prison as a non-registrant and I share the concern for the COs in prison. I admit that I would just as soon not have our letters censored—although I have not felt particularly hampered in writing. I do know that in some prisons censorship is more strict and may be more so in the case of COs. But I earnestly plead that we do not weaken our cause by asking for special favors and privileges.

LOUISA M. GALT
(*Mrs. Ralph M. Galt*)

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

As one of the many imprisoned COs I should like to reply to the article in the August *Fellowship* captioned "Growing Alarm Felt for Imprisoned COs."

We COs are treated like the rest of the inmates—*insofar as our own personalities and actions permit such treatment.* Since we are violators of federal law and since there is no provision by law to distinguish between us and other violators, there is obviously no valid administrative reason for treating us differently.

As to the "vicious and anti-democratic rules and practices in the prisons" mentioned: (1) Prison life by its nature cannot be thoroughly democratic; only a sentimentalist would expect such a state of affairs, where custody is obviously the first problem and responsibility of the prison officials. (2) I dare say that no one realizes the need for further extension of democratic practices in prison life better than the trained penologists who for the most part constitute the policy-making portion of the federal prison system and its administration. We must realize what is so painfully evident to them—democracy in such an institution can grow only insofar as the inmates themselves cooperate and do not take advantage of it. (3) Concerning the word *vicious* as used in the article, I can only say that without documentation it should not have been used at all; certainly I have found nothing vicious in my prison experience from the standpoint of the official administration of the system. (4) We pacifists, of all people, should realize that the administrators of the federal penal system are human beings like ourselves and that they have long been working at a job which we have not deigned to touch. They cannot and should not be expected to consider the COs who come under their jurisdiction as anything but further complications in a task that was already difficult enough. It does not seem too farfetched to me to suggest that perhaps COs should be more concerned to do what they can to help the administrators of the prisons than to try to get privilege for themselves.

Concerning coercion and repressive measures used against inmate COs, we must remember the very large number of maladjusted and cantankerous men who grace the pacifist movement and who appear particularly often in its more radical manifestations. Such people are essentially violent themselves, and consequently they beget violence in the prison officials whom they offend.

If the COs in prison will concentrate their efforts on making themselves truly non-violent and loving (as well as a little more lovable), most of their discomfort and their friends' alarm will automatically subside. There are all too many of us who are still merely negative, always "against" evil and evils. It seems to me that prison is an excellent place in which to practice what we have so long preached: patient, self-giving love for the men with whom we live and associate, whether they agree with us and love us or not.

AN INMATE.

(*Ed. Note—The writer of the above letter is a well-known and beloved member of the FOR, whose arguments deserve respectful consideration. In regard to his reference to "maladjusted and cantankerous" pacifists, however, two points should be made: (a) at least some of those who have collided with prison rules and authorities cannot by the widest stretch of imagination be included in such category; and (b) even to such individuals a "violent" reaction on the part of prison authorities cannot be tolerated by the citizens of a democracy, upon whom the responsibility for such administration eventually and inevitably devolves.*

An Open Letter to John Haynes Holmes

DEAR DR. HOLMES:

In spite of the fact that you and the editors of *Fellowship* have on a number of occasions pointed out that your column expresses you own views and not necessarily those of the FOR or the magazine, we find a considerable number of persons who feel that the column somehow has "official" standing. That the editors of *Fellowship* value your page we need hardly say, but sometimes we may wish to register some difference of emphasis or opinion and such is the case about certain things you said in our August number.

In that issue you comment on the protests by COs in CPS camps and prison against having to work "without compensation" and many other limitations upon their freedom. We do not enter here into the merits of this or that specific protest: some seem to us much more weighty than others. Nor into the attitude and character of this or that individual: there are, as might be expected, great differences among the thousands of men in CPS. But it seems to us that you misunderstand the attitude and motives of large numbers of the protestants, when you exhort pacifists, of all people "suffering dissatisfactions and disabilities," not to "complain." These men are not complaining about personal inconveniences. They know very well that for their activity they probably will get what you say pacifists ought to expect, "namely degradation, persecution, etc." By keeping still and "gratefully" accepting the *status quo* they easily could escape these.

But surely "involuntary servitude" is not purely subjective or only a matter "of the spirit." The bondage of Negroes in this country was and is an objective evil against which they and we have to struggle—as you have often valiantly done.

Today in this country we have a conscription law that asserts the diabolical principle that the state is the supreme lord of conscience because — though it makes some provision for certain kinds of "conscience"—it insists on the right to compel every man between certain ages to render some form of service that contributes to the war effort. Under it hundreds of men are in prison for conscience' sake, including scores who are admittedly sincere COs but who are held not to be entitled to consideration because of an irreligious, and in our opinion, unconstitutional phrase in the law about "religious training and belief." General Hershey, last March, issued an order to men in Civilian (note) Public Service virtually asserting that they were subject every hour of every day to his command.

When COs refuse to conform, carry on struggle against these evils—not for their own comfort, which is not promoted thereby, but for the sake of all men and for the sake of liberty—are they not rendering a great public service? The early Quakers, denied religious liberty, behaved in much the same fashion. They would not even conform, you remember, in the use of pronouns! Thrown into jail, they continued their witness. Released, they kept right on and were thrown back. At one period a third of them were in jail! After a time men said, in effect: "We have a queer species of human to deal with here. They cannot be bought or coerced. They will not conform to our standards and demands, so we shall have to adapt ourselves to their ways." And ever after men have taken it as a matter of course that Quakers must get special treatment.

Interestingly enough, these people who stand firm unto death for convictions often prove in the end to be great reconcilers, round whose crosses civilizations and churches are built.

THE EDITORS.

Sorry! Every seat is taken . . .

Last year the inability of railroads to handle all the traffic, plus gasoline rationing, persuaded us to substitute, in fear and trembling, four national conferences located in different areas for the conventional one big conference. But it's an ill wind . . . etc. So many more Fellowship members were able to attend these new near-at-home conferences that the same arrangement for this year was a foregone conclusion.

SEVEN TO CHOOSE FROM

Yes, this year there will be not four, but *seven national conferences!* Each will be a real national conference, too, for each will include officers' reports, nomination of Council members, and discussion of Fellowship work for the coming year. Choose the one nearest you and *be sure to come!* It will be a great experience.

MIDWEST

Friday, Sept. 24 through Sunday, Sept. 26, at First Church of the Brethren, 3560 Congress Street, and adjoining Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Ill. Address all correspondence to Roger Axford, FOR, 740 Rush Street, Chicago.

Sessions

Friday: 5-7:45 P.M.—Registration. 8 P.M.—Opening session. Saturday: 9 A.M.—Worship. 9:30 A.M.—Plenary session for discussion followed by business meeting. 2-4 P.M.—Round Table conferences on reports of FOR commissions. 4:30-5:45 P.M.—Denominational pacifist groups. 8 P.M.—Addresses. Sunday: Morning—Worship at First Church of the Brethren.

Speakers

Friday: President Rufus Bowman, Professor Andrew W. Cordier, and A. J. Muste. Saturday: Rev. Frank Laubach, Dean William J. Faulkner. Sunday: Professor Georgia Harkness.

EAST

Friday, Oct. 1 through Sunday, Oct. 3, at Race Street Friends Meeting, 1515 Cherry Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Address all correspondence to Ethan Allen Nevin, FOR, 1924 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

Sessions

Friday: 5-7:45 P.M.—Registration. 8 P.M.—Opening session. Saturday: 9 A.M.—Worship. 9:30 A.M.—Plenary session for discussion followed by business meeting. 2-4 P.M.—Round Table conferences on reports of FOR commissions. 4:30-5:45 P.M.—Denominational pacifist groups. 8 P.M.—Addresses. Sunday: 10:30 A.M.—Worship.

Speakers

Friday: J. Passmore Elkinton, Dean William J. Faulkner, A. J. Muste. Saturday: Tracy Strong, A. Philip Randolph. Sunday: Professors Douglas V. Steere and Roland H. Bainton.

AND FIVE MORE

Although arrangements have not been completed, the programs of the remaining five conferences will be largely similar to those described above.

ROCKY MOUNTAINS: Friday evening, Oct. 1 through Sunday noon, Oct. 3, at Denver, Colo. Write Margaret Rohrer, 440 East 13th Avenue, Denver.

SOUTH—Friday evening, Oct. 8 through Sunday noon, Oct. 10, at Nashville, Tenn. Write Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST—Week of October 18. Write Mary U. Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—Friday evening, Oct. 22 through Sunday noon, Oct. 24. Write Jean G. McKay, 1625 Buchanan Street, San Francisco, Cal.

PACIFIC SOUTHWEST—Friday evening, Oct. 29 through Sunday noon, Oct. 31. Write Glenn E. Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo, Hollywood, Cal.